



UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT  
**NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD**  
**OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL**  
Washington, D.C. 20570

March 28, 2018

Molly Dwyer, Clerk of Court  
Office of the Clerk  
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit  
P.O. Box 193939  
San Francisco, CA 94119-3939

Re: *NLRB v. Pro Works Contracting, Inc.*,  
Board Case Nos. 21-CA-161599 and 21-  
CA-162578

Dear Ms. Dwyer:

I am enclosing the Board's application for summary entry of a judgment enforcing the Board's order in this case and a proposed judgment.

Please serve a copy of the application on Respondent, whose addresses appear on the service list. I have served a copy of the Board's application and proposed judgment on each party admitted to participate in the Board proceedings, and their names and addresses appear on the service list.

I am counsel of record for the Board and all correspondence should be addressed to me. I would appreciate your furnishing the Board's Regional Director, whose name and address also appear on the service list, with a copy of all correspondence the Court sends to counsel in this case and a copy of the judgment issued.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Linda Dreeben

Linda Dreeben  
Deputy Associate General Counsel  
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD  
1015 Half Street, S.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20570  
(202) 273-2960

cc & documents to: Service List

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD	:	
	:	No.
Petitioner	:	
v.	:	Board Case Nos.
	:	21-CA-161599
PRO WORKS CONTRACTING, INC.	:	21-CA-162578
	:	
Respondent	:	

APPLICATION FOR SUMMARY ENTRY OF A JUDGMENT  
ENFORCING AN ORDER OF  
THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

To the Honorable, the Judges of the United States  
Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit:

The National Labor Relations Board (the “Board”), pursuant to Section 10(e) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended (29 U.S.C. §§ 151, 160(e)), applies to this Court for summary entry of a judgment enforcing its order against Pro Works Contracting, Inc. (“Respondent”). The Board is entitled to summary enforcement of its order because Respondent did not contest that it had defaulted on its settlement agreement and the Board entered an order by default. In support, the Board shows:

**A. Jurisdiction of this Court**

This Court has jurisdiction over this application under Section 10(e) of the Act (29 U.S.C. § 160(e)). Venue is proper in this Circuit because the unfair labor

practices occurred in California. The Board's final order issued on December 13, 2017, and is reported at 365 NLRB No. 150.

## **B. Proceedings Before the Board**

1. On May 4, 2016, the General Counsel issued a consolidated complaint and notice of hearing in Case Nos. 21-CA-161599 and 21-CA-162578 charging Respondent with certain violations of the Act.

2. The parties entered into an informal settlement agreement which was approved by the Regional Director for Region 21 on June 21, 2016. Among other things, the settlement agreement required the Respondent to: The settlement agreement required the Respondent to post a Board Notice to Employees for 60 days and to mail the notice to all current and former employees employed since September 1, 2015. The settlement agreement further required that the notice be read to all current employees during regular work time.

3. The agreement also contained the following provision:

Performance by the Charged Party with the terms and provisions of this Agreement shall commence immediately after the Agreement is approved by the Regional Director, or if the Charging Party does not enter into this Agreement, performance shall commence immediately upon receipt by the Charged Party of notice that no review has been requested or that the General Counsel has sustained the Regional Director.

The Charged Party agrees that in case of non-compliance with any of the terms of this Settlement Agreement by the Charged Party, and after 14 days notice from the Regional Director of the National Labor Relations Board of such non-compliance without remedy by the

Charged Party, the Regional Director will reissue the Consolidated Complaint (Complaint) previously issued on May 4, 2016, in the instant cases. Thereafter, the General Counsel may file a Motion for Default Judgment with the Board on the allegations of the Complaint. The Charged Party understands and agrees that all of the allegations of the Complaint will be deemed admitted and that it will have waived its right to file an Answer to such Complaint. The only issue that the Charged Party may raise before the Board will be whether it defaulted on the terms of this Settlement Agreement. The General Counsel may seek, and the Board may impose, a full remedy for each unfair labor practice identified in the Notice to Employees. The Board may then, without necessity of trial or any other proceeding, find all allegations of the Complaint to be true and make findings of fact and conclusions of law consistent with those allegations adverse to the Charged Party on all issues raised by the pleadings. The Board may then issue an Order providing a full remedy for the violations found as is appropriate to remedy such violations. The parties further agree that a U.S. Court of Appeals Judgment may be entered enforcing the Board Order ex parte, after service or attempted service upon Charged Party at the last address provided to the General Counsel.

4. On August 8, 2016, the Region sent a compliance package to the Respondent and a letter describing the Respondent's obligations under the settlement agreement. The Region also emailed, on August 8 and 9, respectively, copies of the compliance package to Gary Lane, the Respondent's office manager, and to Earl Register, President and Owner of Pro Works Contracting, Inc.

5. The Region received no response from the Respondent.

6. By letters dated April 6, 2017 and June 15, 2017, the Region Director sent to Respondent default warning letters along with another copy of the compliance package. The June 15 letter advised the Respondent that if its

noncompliance was not cured by June 29, 2017, the Region would invoke the default provision in the settlement agreement, reissue the consolidated complaint, and file a motion for default judgment with the Board.

7. The Respondent did not comply.

8. Pursuant to the noncompliance provisions of the settlement agreement, on July 31, 2017, the Regional Director reissued the complaint and, on August 1, 2017 the General Counsel filed a Motion for Default Judgment with the Board.

9. By order dated August 4, 2017, the Board transferred the case to itself and issued a Notice to Show Cause, giving Respondent until August 18, 2017, to file a response to the Motion for Default Judgment with the Board in Washington, D.C.

10. No response was filed by Respondent. The allegations in the motion were therefore undisputed.

11. In the absence of a response to the Motion for Default Judgment and pursuant to the noncompliance provisions of the settlement agreement, on December 13, 2017, the Board issued its Decision and Order the granting the Motion for Default Judgment and entered an appropriate order against the Respondent.

### **C. The Board Is Entitled to Summary Enforcement of Its Order**

On these facts, the Board is entitled to summary enforcement of its order

against Respondent. The settlement agreement provided that in case of noncompliance the complaint allegations would be deemed admitted and the only issue that could be raised before the Board is whether the Respondent had defaulted on the terms of the settlement agreement. The Respondent did not raise any issues before the Board and did not contest that it had defaulted on the terms of the settlement agreement.

It is settled that the Board is entitled to have its default judgment summarily enforced. Under Section 10(e) of the Act (29 U.S.C. § 160(e)), no objection that has not been urged before the Board shall be considered by a court of appeals “unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances.” Interpreting that requirement, courts have consistently held that a respondent’s failure to assert any defense before the Board entitles the Board, absent extraordinary circumstances, to summary enforcement of its order. *See, e.g., NLRB v. Continental Hagen Corp.*, 932 F.2d 828, 830 (9th Cir. 1991); *Father and Sons Lumber v. NLRB*, 931 F.2d 1093, 1095-96, 1097 (6th Cir. 1991); *NLRB v. Dane County Dairy*, 795 F.2d 1313, 1319-21 (7th Cir. 1986); *Oldwick Materials, Inc. v. NLRB*, 732 F.2d 339, 341 (3d Cir. 1984); *NLRB v. Aaron Convalescent Home*, 479 F.2d 736, 738-39 (6th Cir. 1973). No such circumstances have been alleged or shown here.

WHEREFORE, the Board respectfully requests that the Court, after serving notice of the filing of this application on Respondent, enter judgment summarily enforcing the Board's order in full. A proposed judgment is attached.

/s/ Linda Dreeben

Linda Dreeben

Deputy Associate General Counsel

National Labor Relations Board

1015 Half Street, S.E.

Washington, D.C. 20570

Dated in Washington, D.C.  
this 28th day of March 2018

*NOTICE: This opinion is subject to formal revision before publication in the bound volumes of NLRB decisions. Readers are requested to notify the Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D.C. 20570, of any typographical or other formal errors so that corrections can be included in the bound volumes.*

**Pro Works Contracting, Inc. and Iron Workers Local 229, International Association of Bridge, Structural, Ornamental and Reinforcing Iron Workers, AFL-CIO.** Cases 21-CA-161599 and 21-CA-162578

December 13, 2017

**DECISION AND ORDER**

BY MEMBERS MCFERRAN, KAPLAN, AND EMANUEL

The General Counsel seeks a default judgment in this case pursuant to the terms of an informal settlement agreement. Upon a charge and an amended charge in Case 21-CA-161599 filed by Iron Workers Local 229, International Association of Bridge, Structural, Ornamental and Reinforcing Iron Workers, AFL-CIO (the Union), on October 8 and November 17, 2015, respectively, and a charge and an amended charge in Case 21-CA-162578 filed by the Union on October 22 and November 17, 2015, respectively, the General Counsel issued the consolidated complaint on May 4, 2016, against Pro Works Contracting, Inc. (the Respondent), alleging that the Respondent violated Section 8(a)(3) and (1) of the Act.

Subsequently, the Respondent entered into a unilateral informal settlement agreement, which was approved by the Regional Director on June 21, 2016.<sup>1</sup> The settlement agreement required the Respondent to post at its facilities a Board Notice to Employees, in English and Spanish, for 60 days and to mail the notice to all current employees and former employees employed at any time since September 1, 2015. The settlement agreement further required that the Respondent's president and owner, Earl Register, would read the Board notice to all current employees during regular work time. The settlement agreement also contained the following provision:

Performance by the Charged Party with the terms and provisions of this Agreement shall commence immediately after the Agreement is approved by the Regional Director, or if the Charging Party does not enter into this Agreement, performance shall commence immediately upon receipt by the Charged Party of notice that no review has been requested or that the General Counsel has sustained the Regional Director.

<sup>1</sup> The Union did not enter into the settlement agreement, and appealed the Regional Director's approval of it. On July 21, 2016, the Office of Appeals sustained the Regional Director's approval.

The Charged Party agrees that in case of non-compliance with any of the terms of this Settlement Agreement by the Charged Party, and after 14 days notice from the Regional Director of the National Labor Relations Board of such non-compliance without remedy by the Charged Party, the Regional Director will reissue the Consolidated Complaint (Complaint) previously issued on May 4, 2016, in the instant cases. Thereafter, the General Counsel may file a Motion for Default Judgment with the Board on the allegations of the Complaint. The Charged Party understands and agrees that all of the allegations of the Complaint will be deemed admitted and that it will have waived its right to file an Answer to such Complaint. The only issue that the Charged Party may raise before the Board will be whether it defaulted on the terms of this Settlement Agreement. The General Counsel may seek, and the Board may impose, a full remedy for each unfair labor practice identified in the Notice to Employees. The Board may then, without necessity of trial or any other proceeding, find all allegations of the Complaint to be true and make findings of fact and conclusions of law consistent with those allegations adverse to the Charged Party on all issues raised by the pleadings. The Board may then issue an Order providing a full remedy for the violations found as is appropriate to remedy such violations. The parties further agree that a U.S. Court of Appeals Judgment may be entered enforcing the Board Order ex parte, after service or attempted service upon Charged Party at the last address provided to the General Counsel.

On August 8, 2016, the Region sent a compliance package to the Respondent containing copies of the conformed settlement agreement, the Notice to Employees, and a letter describing the Respondent's obligations under the settlement agreement. The Region also emailed, on August 8 and 9, respectively, copies of the compliance package to Gary Lane, the Respondent's office manager, and to Register. The Region received no response from the Respondent.

In January and February 2017, the Region again solicited the Respondent, through multiple emails to Lane, to comply with its obligations under the settlement agreement and provided instructions and deadlines for the Respondent in this regard. On April 6, 2017, the Regional Director sent the Respondent, by emails to Register and Lane and by UPS shipment, a default warning letter, along with another copy of the compliance package. The Respondent refused delivery of the UPS shipment. On June 15, 2017, the Regional Director sent the Respond-



ent, by emails to Register and Lane and by certified mail, a revised default warning letter and another copy of the compliance package. The Respondent refused delivery of the certified mail. The June 15 letter advised the Respondent that if its noncompliance was not cured by June 29, 2017, the Region would invoke the default provision in the settlement agreement, reissue the consolidated complaint, and file a motion for default judgment with the Board. The Respondent failed to comply.

Accordingly, pursuant to the terms of the noncompliance provisions of the settlement agreement, on July 31, 2017, the Regional Director reissued the consolidated complaint. On August 1, 2017, the General Counsel filed a Motion for Default Judgment with the Board. On August 4, 2017, the Board issued an order transferring the proceeding to the Board and a Notice to Show Cause why the motion should not be granted. The Respondent filed no response. The allegations in the motion are therefore undisputed.

The National Labor Relations Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to a three-member panel.

#### Ruling on Motion for Default Judgment

According to the uncontroverted allegations in the motion for default judgment, the Respondent has failed to comply with the terms of the settlement agreement by failing to post, mail, and read the Notice to Employees in the manner prescribed in the settlement agreement. Consequently, pursuant to the noncompliance provisions of the settlement agreement set forth above, we find that all of the allegations in the reissued consolidated complaint are true.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, we grant the General Counsel's Motion for Default Judgment.

On the entire record, the Board makes the following

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

##### I. JURISDICTION

At all material times, the Respondent has been a corporation with an office and place of business in Santee, California, and has been engaged in the business of general contracting and steel reinforcement subcontracting in the building and construction industry.

In conducting its operations, during the 12-month period ending October 21, 2015, the Respondent performed services valued in excess of \$50,000 to Lusardi Construction Company (Lusardi), an enterprise engaged in the business of general contracting in the building and construction industry, with an office and place of business in San Marcos, California. During the 12-month period ending October 21, 2015, Lusardi, in conducting its operations described above, purchased and received at

its San Marcos facility goods valued in excess of \$50,000 directly from points outside the State of California.

We find that the Respondent is an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(2), (6), and (7) of the Act, and that the Union is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

##### II. ALLEGED UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

At all material times, the following individuals held the positions set forth opposite their respective names and have been supervisors of the Respondent within the meaning of Section 2(11) of the Act and agents of the Respondent within the meaning of Section 2(13) of the Act:

Earl Register	President
Tom Coker	Superintendent/Representative
Brian Payne	- Foreman
Patrick Brown	Foreman

The Respondent engaged in the following conduct, giving rise to these proceedings.

1. About July 29, 2015, the Respondent, by Earl Register, during a telephone call, interrogated an employee about the employee's union activities and support.

2. About September 4, 2015, at the Respondent's Kearny Mesa Sun Road project (Sun Road project), the Respondent, by Brian Payne, interrogated an employee about the employee's activities and support.

3. About September 10, 2015, at the Sun Road project, the Respondent, by Payne, coerced an employee by ripping up a union representative's business card and telling an employee not to have union materials at the work place.

4. About September 10, 2015, at the Sun Road project, the Respondent, by Payne, directed an employee to report the union activities of other employees to the Respondent.

5. About September 10, 2015, at the Sun Road project, the Respondent, by Payne, threatened an employee with termination because of the employee's union activities and support.

6. About September 27, 2015, during a telephone conversation, the Respondent, by Payne, threatened to isolate an employee by giving the employee work assignments away from others because of the employee's union activities and support.

7. Since about September 10, 2015, the Respondent, by Register and Payne, has prohibited union activity at the Sun Road project by requiring employees wearing clothing with union insignia to wear vests over such clothing.

8. About September 10, 2015, the Respondent assigned its employee Robert Whitman more onerous work

<sup>2</sup> See *U-Bee, Ltd.*, 315 NLRB 667 (1994).

duties (bending z-bars) because Whitman joined or assisted the Union and engaged in concerted activities, and to discourage employees from engaging in these activities.

9. From about October 15 to about October 21, 2015, the Respondent assigned its employee Marc Barry more onerous work duties (punking rebar) because Barry joined or assisted the Union and engaged in concerted activities, and to discourage employees from engaging in these activities.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

By the conduct described above in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, the Respondent has been interfering with, restraining, and coercing employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in Section 7 of the Act in violation of Section 8(a)(1) of the Act.

By the conduct described above in paragraphs 8 and 9, the Respondent has been discriminating in regard to the hire or tenure or terms or conditions of employment of its employees, thereby discouraging membership in a labor organization, in violation of Section 8(a)(3) and (1) of the Act.

The Respondent's unfair labor practices affect commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

#### REMEDY

Having found that the Respondent has engaged in certain unfair labor practices, we shall order it to take certain affirmative actions designed to effectuate the policies of the Act. Specifically, we shall order the Respondent to comply with the unmet terms of the settlement agreement approved by the Regional Director for Region 21 on June 21, 2016, by posting, mailing, and reading the notices provided by the Board in the manner prescribed in the settlement agreement.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> In his motion for default judgment, the General Counsel stated that the Respondent has failed to post, mail, or read the notice to employees under the terms of the settlement agreement. The General Counsel requested that the Board "[i]ssue a Decision and Order against Respondent containing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law based on, and in accordance with, the allegations of the Re-issued Consolidated Complaint, and provide a full remedy for each and every unfair labor practice violation." The General Counsel further specifically requested "that the Board-ordered Notice, along with the mechanics of the Notice-mailing and/or Notice-reading obligation, track the terms and Notice of the Settlement Agreement." In the particular circumstances of this case, we construe the General Counsel's motion as a request to enforce the unmet terms of the settlement agreement. See, e.g., *Perkins Management Services*, 365 NLRB No. 90 (2017) (construing General Counsel's motion for default judgment to seek enforcement of unmet settlement terms when he specifically requested an order requiring the respondent to fulfill its undertakings in that agreement); *Benchmark Mechanical, Inc.*, 348 NLRB 576 (2006).

#### ORDER

The National Labor Relations Board orders that the Respondent, Pro Works Contracting, Inc., Santee, California, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns shall take the following affirmative action necessary to effectuate the policies of the Act.

Post at its Santee facility copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix,"<sup>4</sup> in English and Spanish and signed and dated by Earl Register (Owner), for 60 consecutive days.

Mail, at its own expense, the attached notice, in English and Spanish and signed and dated by Earl Register, to all current employees and all former employees employed at any time since September 1, 2015.

During the 60-day posting period, have Earl Register read the notice, in English, to all current employees convened at the Respondent's facility located at 10612 Prospect Avenue, Suite 105, Santee, California. This reading will occur during the employees' regular work time. The date of the scheduled reading must be approved by the Regional Director for Region 21. The Respondent will notify employees, in writing, at least 5 days before the scheduled reading, as to the location, time, and date of the reading. The written notification will also inform employees that they will be paid their regular hourly rate/salary for the time it takes employees to travel to/from the reading location, as well as for the time they are at the office for the reading. The Respondent will provide Region 21 with a copy of the draft notification letter before sending it to employees. The draft must be approved by the Regional Director for Region 21 before the final version is sent to employees. A Board agent will be present during the reading. After Earl Register

In its joinder to the General Counsel's Motion for Default Judgment, the Union requests that the Board order the Respondent to post the appropriate Board notice for the time period between the filing of the unfair labor practice charges and the date the notices are actually posted; to post the Board's Employee Rights Notice Posting for 5 years; to buy 10 copies of the book "California Workers' Rights" and distribute them to employees; and to allow the Union to visit job sites for 30 minutes per week for 1 year. We deny these requests because the Union has not shown that these additional measures are needed to remedy the effects of the Respondent's unfair labor practices. See generally *Alstyle Apparel*, 351 NLRB 1287, 1288 (2007). Finally, the Union requests that the remedial notice state that the Respondent has been found to have violated the National Labor Relations Act. With respect to this request, we note that the attached notice, which conforms to the Board's standard remedial language, states that the Respondent "violated Federal labor law."

<sup>4</sup> If this Order is enforced by a judgment of a United States court of appeals, the words in the notice reading "Posted and Mailed by Order of the National Labor Relations Board" shall read "Posted and Mailed Pursuant to a Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals Enforcing an Order of the National Labor Relations Board."

reads the notice to employees in English, the Board agent will then read the notice in Spanish.

Within 21 days after service by the Region, file with the Regional Director for Region 21 a sworn certification of a responsible official on a form provided by the Region attesting to the steps that the Respondent has taken to comply.

Dated, Washington, D.C. December 13, 2017

---

Lauren McFerran, Member

---

Marvin E. Kaplan, Member

---

William J. Emanuel, Member

(SEAL) NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

#### APPENDIX

NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES  
POSTED AND MAILED BY ORDER OF THE  
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD  
An Agency of the United States Government

The National Labor Relations Board has found that we violated Federal labor law and has ordered us to post and obey this notice.

#### FEDERAL LAW GIVES YOU THE RIGHT TO

Form, join, or assist a union  
Choose representatives to bargain with us on  
your behalf

Act together with other employees for your benefit and protection

Choose not to engage in any of these protected activities.

WE WILL NOT interrogate employees about their union activities or support.

WE WILL NOT, unless required by a general contractor, require employees to wear vests at projects so as to cover up union insignia they are wearing, or inform employees that they have to wear vests to cover union insignia.

WE WILL NOT assign employees more onerous work duties (such as bending z-bars or punking rebar) because of their union activities or support

WE WILL NOT threaten to isolate, discipline, or terminate employees because of their union activities or support.

WE WILL NOT direct employees to report the union activities or sympathies of other employees to us.

WE WILL NOT in any like or related manner interfere with your rights under Section 7 of the Act.

PRO WORKS CONTRACTING, INC.

The Board's decision can be found at [www.nlrb.gov/case/21-CA-161599](http://www.nlrb.gov/case/21-CA-161599) or by using the QR code below. Alternatively, you can obtain a copy of the decision from the Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, 1015 Half Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20570, or by calling (202) 273-1940.



SERVICE LIST

RESPONDENT:

Earl Register, Pres./Owner  
Pro Works Contracting, Inc.  
10612 Prospect Avenue, Ste. 105  
Santee, CA 92071

Earl Register, Pres./Owner  
3442 Gird Rd.  
Fallbrook, CA 92028

email:

proworkscontracting.earl@gmail.com  
proworkscontracting@gmail.com

THE BOARD IS NOT AWARE OF  
PRESENT COUNSEL FOR  
RESPONDENT

REGIONAL DIRECTOR:

William B. Cowen, Regional Director  
National Labor Relations Board  
888 South Figueroa Street, 9th Fl.  
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5449

CHARGING PARTY:

Johnny Swanson, Union Rep.  
Iron Workers Local Union 229  
5155 Mercury Point  
San Diego, CA 92111

Tel: (858) 571-5238  
Fax: (858) 571-5238

CHARGING PARTY COUNSEL:

David A. Rosenfeld, Attorney  
Weinberg Roger & Rosenfeld  
1001 Marina Village Pky. Ste. 200  
Alameda, CA 94501-6430

Phone: (510) 337-1001  
Fax: (510) 337-1023  
Email: [drosenfeld@unioncounsel.net](mailto:drosenfeld@unioncounsel.net)

CHARGING PARTY COUNSEL:

Caren P. Sencer Esq.  
Weinberg, Roger & Rosenfeld  
1001 Marina Village Pky., Ste 200  
Alameda, CA 94501

Tel: (510) 337-1001  
Fax: (510) 337-1023  
Email: [csencer@unioncounsel.net](mailto:csencer@unioncounsel.net)

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD	:	
	:	No.
Petitioner	:	
v.	:	Board Case Nos.
	:	21-CA-161599
PRO WORKS CONTRACTING, INC.	:	21-CA-162578
	:	
Respondent	:	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the Board's application for summary entry of judgment, proposed judgment and mediation questionnaire in the above-captioned case has been electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit using the appellate CM/ECF system. The undersigned further certifies that a copy of the above described documents has this day been served by first class mail upon the following parties at the addresses listed below:

Earl Register, Pres./Owner  
Pro Works Contracting, Inc.  
10612 Prospect Avenue, Ste. 105  
Santee, CA 92071

Earl Register,  
Pres./Owner  
3442 Gird Rd.  
Fallbrook, CA 92028

/s/ Linda Dreeben

Linda Dreeben  
Deputy Associate General Counsel  
National Labor Relations Board  
1015 Half Street, S.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20570

Dated at Washington, D.C.  
this 28th day of March 2018